

REMARKS

In the Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to replace the phrase "temperatures significantly below 100°C" with "--temperatures below 100°C--". This amendment is supported by the specification, for example, page 11, lines 1-8; page 13, lines 22-26 and page 21, lines 2-4. Particularly, the specification describes at page 13, lines 22-26, a further preferred embodiment where the second step is effected by adding the mixture or solution of amine and solvent to the polymer melt cooled to below 100°C. In addition, the specification provides an example where a mixture of 2-phenylethylamine and water is mixed into the polymer melt BP2 which has a temperature of 80°C (page 21, lines 2-4). Claims 1-18 and 25-45 have been amended to further improve their form. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully submit that entry of the amendments, after final, is proper, at least because they place the application either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. See M.P.E.P. § 714.12. Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1-18 and 25-45 will be all the claims pending in the application.

I. Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-16, 18, 25-39 and 41-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are not indefinite for at least the following reason.

As noted above, claim 1, from which claims 2-16, 18, 25-39 and 41-45 depend, has been amended to replace "temperatures significantly below 100°C" with "--temperatures below 100°C--", which clearly encompasses any temperature below 100°C.

Regarding claim 15, claim 15 recites that in the monoamine compound A' of the formula (II'), the substituent R^{2'} is of formula (V') and R^{3'} is H. As it clearly states, R^{2'} and R^{3'} are the substituents of the formula (II') and not of the formula (V').

In view of the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the § 112 rejection.

II. Response to Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-15, 17, 18, 25-37 and 40-45 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 12/311,730.

Without addressing the propriety of this rejection, Applicants respectfully request that such rejection be held in abeyance until the present application is found to be in condition for allowance.

III. Conclusion

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order and such action is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at his earliest convenience.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17 and 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: February 18, 2011

By: 

Fang Liu, Ph.D.
Registration No. 51283

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620